

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Airport

**Member:** Alex Erskine 828-4966

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village of Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

No Comments

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Engineering

**Member:** Tim Welch  
Engineering Design Mgr.  
Office Ph. (954) 828-5123  
Office Fax: (954) 828-5275  
Email: [timw@cityfort.com](mailto:timw@cityfort.com)

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

1. This site was reviewed on June 21, 2002. Applicant shall be required to resolve all pending items identified in that DRC review as well as document those revisions as applicable following the review by the Property and Right of Way Committee.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Fire

**Member:** Albert Weber  
954-828-5875

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

1. Show hydrant location and provide a flow test.
2. Hydrants required every 300 ft per ISO regulations.
3. Sprinkler systems required at permit phase.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Info. Systems

**Member:** Mark Pallans (GRG)  
828-5790

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

No apparent interference will result from this plan at this time.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Landscape

**Member:** Dave Gennaro  
828-5200

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

1. The Tree Survey list on sheet L-3 shows several potentially “speciman” trees to be removed. As an informational comment, the sole method of issuing a permit to remove these type of trees is for the applicant to pay a “cash value” to the Tree Canopy Trust Fund. This would be based on the cross sectional trunk diameter of the tree; for Live Oaks this would be \$25.00 per square inch.
2. For those trees not “speciman trees”, provide the calculations for the “equivalent replacement” above minimum site Code requirements for trees and palms removed.

# **DRC**

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**

### **REPORT**

**Division:** Planning

**Member:** Don Morris  
954-828-5264

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

#### **Project Description:**

The petitioners propose to construct a live/work development on a 14.34 acre parcel in the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) district. The proposal is to rezone from Community Facilities (CF) district to PUD district, which requires a Level IV Site Plan Review (P&Z and City Commission).

#### **Comments:**

1. Amend the text narrative to further describe the following:
  - a. The integration of uses within the proposed development and the existing neighborhood.
  - b. The breakdown and combinations of residential types described on page 6 of the narrative.
  - c. The “precedent” that explains why if the boardwalk was extended to the west, it would be underutilized (discussed on page 11).
  - d. The difference between apartments and “villa-style” units (discussed on page 15).
  - e. How the construction of single-family detached homes along the river frontage “counteracts” TND principals (discussed on page 33).
  - f. Which buildings in the neighborhood that the proposed multi-family buildings are similar to in mass (page 36).
2. Provide a table indicating the required and all proposed building setbacks and building heights for each block in the project. This table is to be indicated on the site plan as a part of the site data information area.
3. Replace townhouse-style development with single-family detached dwellings along the river frontage. The predominant development pattern on both sides of the river in this area is single-family detached dwellings.
4. Provide parking calculations for the non-residential uses proposed on the site.

# **DRC**

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**

### **REPORT**

Page 2

DRC Case No. 1-ZPUD-02

October 22, 2002

5. There are 382 on-site parking spaces proposed for this development, where 521 spaces are required. Therefore, an additional 139 parking spaces are required.
6. The 83 proposed off-site/street parallel parking spaces may only be used for a parking reduction request, and can not be used to satisfy off-street parking requirements.
7. Consider providing parking within the building envelope as was done in Buildings 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 in other portions of the development. The utilization of this concept in other areas of the development will reduce the number of parking spaces required in the interior parking lots and provide an opportunity to create more open/green space.
8. The proposed development appears to exceed the trip threshold, which may trigger the need for a traffic study. Discuss traffic requirements with engineering representative.
9. The proposed building lengths for Buildings 9-10, 3-4, 7-12 and 1-6 all exceed 200', which is the maximum length permitted for multi-family residential developments in other residential zoning districts. Remove the units over the drives to break up the length of the building and reduce the overall height.
10. All of the proposed building heights exceed building heights allowed in the RML-25 and RS-8 districts, which are the predominant residential zoning districts in the immediate area.
11. The dumpster shown on the south side of the private street, west of the school and artspace should be moved further east away from the street front.
12. Efforts should be made to save or relocate as many desirable trees as possible as stipulated in Section 47-21.12 (A) (3). Discuss requirements with landscape representative.
13. The proposed boardwalk loops into a vehicular drive. Extend the boardwalk west along the river and tie into pedestrian circulation on the south side of SW 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
14. Remove park/open space reference given to the retention areas, as they will be inundated with water during the summer months and not lend themselves to year-round usable park/open space.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

Page 3  
DRC Case No. 1-ZPUD-02  
October 22, 2002

15. Landscaping shall conform to Section 47-21. Discuss landscape improvements and street tree spacing with landscaping representative.
16. Show adjacent structures and uses on the site plan.
17. Improvements in the public right-of-way shall adhere to engineering standards.
18. Additional comments may be forthcoming.



**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Police **Member:** Det. C. Cleary- Robitaille  
(954) 828-6419

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend **Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

1. Impact resistant material should be used on all glass areas.
2. Each unit should be equipped with a perimeter alarm and a glass breaking sensor system, as well as a panic and fire alert system.
3. Decorative wrought iron security fencing should be placed under each exterior stairwell.
4. Each stairwell should be gated with decorative wrought iron fencing. These gates should be under key control.
5. There does not appear to be any perimeter or access control of the property. How will undesirable vehicular traffic as well as individuals and activity be kept out of the area?
6. All lighting should meet with IESNA standards. Particular attention should be paid to walkways, drive through areas and stairwells.

Please submit comments in writing prior to DRC sign off.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

**Division:** Zoning

**Member:** Terry Burgess  
(954) 828-5913

**Project Name:** School Board of Broward County/  
The Village at Sailboat Bend

**Case #:** 1-ZPUD-02

**Date:** 10/22/02

**Comments:**

1. Provide a narrative outlining how the proposed mixed use development complies with the following sections: 47-18.21, 47-25.2, 47-25.3.
2. Parking data as calculated indicates a shortage of forty-four (44) parking spaces. 1). A mixed use developments parking shall be calculated by uses within the development site, for instance residential uses and non-residential uses, which creates a greater parking deficiency. 2). Parking data includes the parallel parking spaces located in the public right-of-way which is not permitted pursuant to section 47-20.2. 3). Tandem parking is prohibited pursuant to section 47-20.10. 4). Parallel parking spaces shall be a minimum of 8'8" x 24' pursuant to section 47-20.11. 5). Two (2) foot bumper overhangs encroach onto the brick-paver walk blocking the proposed pedestrian path.
3. Multiple family dwellings and townhouses are not a permitted use in the RS-8 zoning districts. Maximum building height permitted is thirty-five (35) in the RS-8 zoning district pursuant to section 47-5.11 and 47-5.31.
4. Setbacks requirements for RML-25 zoning districts are as follows: Front yard- 25', Side yard- 10', Rear-20' and Corner-25'. The maximum allowable height in the RML-25 zoning district is thirty-five (35) feet. The maximum building length in the RML-25 is two hundred (200) feet pursuant to section 47-5.35.
5. Photometric lighting plan indicate footcandle illuminations that exceed .5 footcandles at the adjacent residential property pursuant to the requirements of section 47-20.14 and 47-25.3.
6. Discuss the site circulation with the Engineering representative.

**DRC**  
**SITE PLAN REVIEW AND COMMENT**  
**REPORT**

Page 2  
DRC Case No. 1-ZPUD-02  
October 22, 2002

7. Provide building height from grade as defined in section 47-2.
8. Discuss design standards requirements with Planning representative.
9. Additional comments may be forthcoming at DRC meeting.